

has identified different classifications, it is believed that classification is not conclusive on the question of restriction especially in view of computer searching. It is believed, moreover, that evaluation of both sets of claims would not provide an undue burden upon the Examiner at this time in comparison with the additional expense and delay to Applicant in having to protect the additional subject matter recited by the claims of Group I by filing a divisional application.

III. Conclusion

Upon review of references involved in this field of technology, when considering the subject matter of the claim groups, and when all of the other various facts are taken into consideration, it is believed that upon reconsideration of the Examiner's initial restriction requirement, all of the pending claims should be examined in the subject application.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 19-3935.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

May 12 2005

By:

Mark J. Henry

Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501